

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/052,815	01/18/2002	Phillip L. Wimmer	10012053-1	3187
	7590 04/16/2008			EXAMINER	
HEWETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration					
	P.O. Box 27240			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2008

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application/Control Number: 10/052,815

Art Unit: 1792

## Continuation of PTOL-462

Item #4.

While appellants have provided citations of page & line # in their "V. <u>Summery of Claimed Subject Matter"</u>, in general the specific citations do not appear to match up with the topic in the specification, as scanned into the PTO file, for which the citations are supposed to show support.

For example, in the first paragraph of section V, which bridges pages 4-5 Appellants' Brief, and which discusses roughening the surface, directing laser radiation towards the substrate to create ablation debris, which resettles on the surface, the effects of high ablation threshold, and the creation of structures which can improve adhesive properties of the surface. The citation associated with this is "page 3, lines 13-18", however in the specification available to the examiner (hence to the Board), the cited lines state: "process. There is therefore a need for systems and methods that provide improved surface treatments in a cost effective manner for components prior to adhesive bonding.

## Summary of the Invention

The present invention is directed to a method of preparing a surface for adhesion. The method includes providing an initiator that is configured to"

This does not appear to be the information that appellants intended to cite.

In discussing claim 1 (1st full paragraph on page 5 of Brief), after listing the claimed limitations appellants state "As depicted in figs. 3, 4, and 5A-B (and described, for example, at page 7, lines 11-24;...", however the disclosure found therein, which comes from parts of two paragraphs concerning laser parameters and laser apparatus, i.e. "laser parameters for the method, including intensity repetition rate and number of pulses... For example lenses, masks, homogenizers, mirrors, beams stops, attenuators and polarizers are typical elements used to", is questionable as to whether it is what was intended to be cited. The last citation in this paragraph, which says that page 10, lines 24-25 are describing the application of adhesives (70) to surface (34) of substrate (36) in fig. 4, is not to this topic,

Art Unit: 1792

but states: "perpendicular surface between cones, ablation is terminated. Redeposition of debris on

the sides of the cones and in the spaces between the cones may also aid", thus clearly to a different

topic. While some of the citations overlap with described subject matter, the overlap is spotty, such that

there appears to be a mismatch between the specification appellants are employing to give their citations

& the specification present in the scanned file, which is the one which will be reviewed by the Board of

Appeals. Therefore, appellants need to correct their citations, such that appropriately directed review of

the material is possible. Note that the above examples should not be considered a complete delineation of problem citations, but hopefully provide sufficient examples in order for appellants to determine how to

correct their citations, so that we are all looking at the same section of the specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Marianne L. Padgett whose telephone number is  $(571)\ 272\text{-}1425$ . The examiner can

normally be reached on M-F from about 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Timothy Meeks, can be reached at (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Marianne L. Padgett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

MLP/dictation software 4/8/2008